

Bottcher, Helen

From: Bachman, Brenda M NWS <Brenda.M.Bachman@usace.army.mil>
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2015 10:46 AM
To: Bottcher, Helen; Barton, Justine
Subject: RE: Wyckoff - possible new outfall alignment

Helen,

My concerns were related to the limited circulation in the harbor and potential impacts to sediment and future monitoring. I had also hoped that we could get more mixing in the channel.

There are a few assumptions that we should explicitly address/clarify so that we know whether additional monitoring should be considered:

- 1) Treatment plant discharge values are acceptable to any water body (I don't remember how this is currently set up so a short review of the existing discharge permit and concentrations may be warranted along with assurance that future discharge will not be significantly different);
- 2) Storm water will not contain site contaminants based on upland design for maximum runoff volumes (ie, all agree that the remedy is sufficient to contain contaminants);
- 3) Surface water and sediments will not be impacted by discharge- would we need to monitor sediments for any contaminants that we don't already consider (ie, coliform)? ;
- 4) Water quality standards are met where people may swim. Unlike the eastern shoreline, more people use the inner harbor. We previously showed that water quality is sufficient for unrestricted use, however, a new storm water/treated water discharge may require additional assessment due to decreased circulation in this area. I'm guessing that it will be up to the project team to show that the design meets all ARARs but the state may have input based on current discharge permitting requirements. I just don't want to assume that permit requirements have remained the same over time or that they will be the same with a new remedy.

I think you are coordinating with everyone needed- DOE, DNR, Tribes, stakeholders. You may want to talk with discharge permit folks at DOE unless Chung represents that already.

Brenda

-----Original Message-----

From: Bottcher, Helen [mailto:Bottcher.Helen@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 2015 5:12 PM
To: Bachman, Brenda M NWS <Brenda.M.Bachman@usace.army.mil>; Barton, Justine <Barton.Justine@epa.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Wyckoff - possible new outfall alignment

I had a meeting today with the shellfish program folks at WA Dept. of Health. They are concerned about the proposed new outfall pipe because it will discharge onto an approved commercial shellfish growing area. They said ANY outfall would necessitate a closure area, size would depend on the volume and quality of the discharge. The Tribe is adamantly opposed to actions that would result in closure of shellfish area.

DOH suggests we simply move the outfall into an area that is already closed for other reasons. Shortest alignment to get to deep water that is closed is to the west / northwest. See attached for my sketch.

Brenda, when we last met, you said you would be concerned about discharging to the Harbor. Do you still feel that way? What are the potential impacts and who else will I need to coordinate with on this issue? Ecology was in the meeting with me. They said that as a general matter they prefer the eastern alignment because there's more water for dilution, but they could live with discharge to the harbor given that it's just stormwater that would drain to the harbor naturally but for the perimeter wall. (The new outfall will carry treated water from the GWTP for about 5 years but after that, it will only convey stormwater from the surface of the cap. Stormwater should be clean, biggest concern would be coliform from dogs (and geese).

Thoughts? Concerns?

Thanks!

Helen Bottcher | Superfund Project Manager

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Region 10

1200 Sixth Ave, Suite 900 (ECL-113)

Seattle, WA 98101

206-553-6069

bottcher.helen@epa.gov

Follow @EPAnorthwest on Twitter! Blocked<https://twitter.com/EPAnorthwest>
<Blocked<https://twitter.com/EPAnorthwest>>